

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the application are respectfully requested in view of the amendments and remarks herewith, which place the application into condition for allowance. The present amendment is being made to facilitate prosecution of the application.

Applicants note that the Office Action stated that the date for which foreign priority is claimed is not the date of the filed application acknowledged in the declaration. Applicants respectfully submit that the priority date of January 6, 2000, which is acknowledged in the declaration, is the foreign priority date.

I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS AND FORMAL MATTERS

Claims 1-9 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 have been amended. Claims 8 and 9 have been added. Support for this amendment is provided throughout the Specification as originally filed, and specifically at pages 10-14 and Figure 3. No new matter has been introduced by this amendment. Changes to claims are not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §101, §102, §103, or §112. Rather, these changes are made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which Applicants are entitled.

II. REJECTIONS

Claims 1-6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,898,830 to Wesinger et al. Claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,898,830 to Wesinger et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,435,737 to Haga et al. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

Independent claim 1, as amended, recites, *inter alia*:

“...wherein said setup information allows the client to have
said Internet server set up for Internet access upon
installation of said storage medium, and

wherein said setup information stored on said storage
medium is updated when a setting processing procedure
detects a change to said setup information.” (emphasis
added)

Applicants submit that the portions of U.S. Patent No. 5,898,830 to Wesinger cited in the Office Action (hereinafter, merely “Wesinger”) do not disclose the above-identified features of claim 1.

Therefore, independent claim 1 is believed to be allowable.

For reasons similar to those described above with regard to independent claim 1, independent claims 4, 5 and 9 are also believed to be allowable.

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for at least the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In the event the Examiner disagrees with any of statements appearing above with respect to the disclosures in the cited references, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner specifically indicate those portions of the references providing the basis for a contrary view.

Please charge any additional fees that may be needed, and credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is believed that all of the claims in this application are patentable and Applicants respectfully request early passage to issue of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,
FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP
Attorneys for Applicants

By 
Dennis M. Smid
Reg. No. 34,930
(212) 588-0800